

Remarks

In response to the Office Action mailed December 29, 2003, Applicants sincerely request reconsideration in view of the above claim amendments and the following remarks. The claims as presented are believed to be in allowable condition.

Claims 1 and 19 have been amended, new claim 23 has been added, and claims 4, 20, and 22 have been canceled. Claim 1 has been amended to specify the features of canceled claim 4. Claim 19 has been amended to specify the features of canceled claims 20 and 22. New claim 23 includes only features recited in claim 19 and canceled claims 20 and 22. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-22 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beauregard et al. (U.S. Patent 5,974,413, hereinafter "Beauregard") in view of Bays et al. (U.S. Patent 6,519,603, hereinafter "Bays"). Claims 19-21 are rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beauregard. It is noted that no rejection in the Office Action specifically references pending claim 22. However, based on the Office Action Summary indicating the rejection of claim 22 along with the other pending claims, it will be assumed for the purposes of the present prosecution that claim 22 is rejected on the same grounds as claim 19 from which it depends.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-22 are objected to as being difficult to read because the lines are crowded to closely together. In response, Applicants have submitted a new listing of the claims above ("Amendments to the Claims"). The new listing of claims includes lines spaced one and one-half spaces apart on good quality paper. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the objections to claims 1-22 should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections—35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beauregard in view of Bays. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Beauregard discloses a semantic user interface (SUI) from which a user is enabled to enter "action words" to control the operations of a computer. An action word may be either a single word or a phrase that includes two or more words. In the SUI, each action word is compared against the contents of a wordbase. The wordbase includes a plurality of item records. Each item record includes an action word and an associated service script for performing various actions such as issuing a command to launch an application. If the action word is located in the wordbase, the service script associated with the action word is executed. (See Col. 5, lines 12-52).

Amended independent claim 1 specifies a method for semantically labeling a string of text in an electronic document created in an application program module. The method includes receiving a string of text in a recognizer dynamic-link library, annotating the string of text to determine a plurality of labels, and transmitting the plurality of labels to the application program module. The plurality of labels are determined by comparing the string of text with a plurality of stored strings with an associated stored label to determine a match. Once a match is made, the method includes labeling the string of text with the associated stored label of the matched stored string. Beauregard fails to teach, disclose, or suggest annotating a string of text to determine a plurality of labels associated with a plurality of stored strings and further transmitting the plurality of labels to an application program module, as specified in amended independent claim 1.

Bays, discloses a method for entering and annotating data indexed items in database material (Col. 2, lines 10-18). It is respectfully submitted, however, that neither Beauregard nor

Bays, alone or in combination, teaches, discloses, or suggests annotating a string of text to determine a plurality of labels associated with a plurality of stored strings and further transmitting the plurality of labels to an application program module, as specified in amended independent claim 1. The Office Action generally alleges that one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine the teachings of Beauregard with the teachings of Bays for the purpose of annotating the text strings disclosed in Bays with the service scripts disclosed in Beauregard to enhance semantic interpretation.

Bays teaches that annotations may be used to capture information such as additional facts about database material (e.g., text strings), the opinions and judgments of experts about the database material, and/or links to other related material. Bays further teaches that annotations may be captured (i.e., entered) in structured form (such as labeled categories) to aid semantic interpretation. For example, a "business meaning" category may aid in the interpretation of a "Comment" field in a database. See Col. 2, lines 38-61. Beauregard teaches the use of service scripts for performing a content, retrieval, navigation or command service in connection with an associated action word. The service scripts in connection with the action words allow a user to launch applications, navigate within applications, and control application functions. See Col. 5, lines 39-50. There is no teaching or suggestion in Beauregard that service scripts may be used to enhance semantic interpretation. In fact, Beauregard actually teaches away from the use of service scripts as proposed in the Office Action by disclosing that service scripts are executed after user-entered dual words are "interpreted" as action words if they are located within a wordbase. Therefore, the combination of Beauregard with Bays would not enhance the semantic interpretation of text strings and thus, the combination fails.

For at least the aforementioned reasons, Beauregard in view of Bays fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in amended independent claim 1. Therefore,

amended independent claim 1 is allowable and the rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

As noted above, claim 4 has been canceled. Dependent claims 2-3 and 5-9 each depend from amended independent claim 1 and thus specify at least the same features as amended independent claim 1. Therefore, dependent claims 2-3 and 5-9 are also allowable for the reasons given above and the rejections of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should also be withdrawn. Independent claims 13 and 14 specify the same features as independent claim 1 and are thus allowable for the reasons given above with respect to independent claim 1. Therefore, the rejections of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should also be withdrawn.

Independent claim 10 and amended independent claim 19 specify similar features as independent claim 1. Specifically, claim 10 specifies a method for determining whether a string of text matches one of a plurality of stored strings and if so, then determining a label associated with the matched stored string. Similarly, claim 19 specifies a system including a recognizer plug-in which receives a string and compares the string to a plurality of stored strings to determine whether the string matches any of the stored strings and, if so, then labeling the string with a label associated with the matched stored string. As discussed above with respect to amended independent claim 1, neither Beauregard nor Bays, alone or in combination, teaches, discloses, or suggests the aforementioned features. Therefore, independent claims 10 and 19 are allowable and the rejections of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should also be withdrawn.

As noted above, claims 20 and 22 have been canceled. Dependent claims 11-18 depend from independent claim 10 and thus specify at least the same features as independent claim 10. Dependent claim 21 depends from amended independent claim 19 thus specifies at least the same features as amended independent claim 19. Therefore, dependent claims 11-18 and 22 are also

allowable for the reasons given above and the rejections of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should also be withdrawn.

New Claims

New claim 23 specifies a system for labeling a string in an electronic document as the string is entered into the electronic documents. The system includes a recognizer plug-in which receives a string and compares the string to a plurality of stored strings to determine whether the string matches any of the stored strings and, if so, then labeling the string with a label associated with the matched stored string. As discussed above with respect to amended independent claim 19, neither Beauregard nor Bays, alone or in combination, teaches, discloses, or suggests the aforementioned features. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that new claim 23 is in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

Authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 13-2725 is included to cover the fee for the addition of 1 new independent claim for a **large** entity. If any additional fees are required for the timely consideration of the application, please charge deposit account number 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

Merchant & Gould P.C.
3200 IDS Center
80 South Eighth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402-2215
Customer No. 27488

Alton Hornsby, III
Registration No. 47,299
March 29, 2004
404-954-5100